

Nevada's 2010 OPSP

Open Project and Selection Process

Nevada Division of State Parks
Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Land and Water Conservation Fund
Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan



Photo by J. Steve Weaver, 2010

Prepared by:
Jennifer Scanland, Park and Recreation Program Manager - Assistant State Liaison Officer

Under the Direction of:
J. Steve Weaver, Deputy Administrator and State Liaison Officer
David Morrow, State Parks Administrator



The policy of the Nevada Division of State Parks is to fully comply with the intent of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Title VI provides that no person in the United States shall, on grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participating in, denied the benefits of, or subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

The preparation of this plan was financed in part through a planning grant from the National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, under the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (Public Law 88-578, as amended).

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Overview of Project Selection Process.....	1
LWCF State Liaison Officer.....	1
Recurring Funding Cycle	2
Local Projects.....	2
State Projects.....	3
Public Notification	3
Program Technical Assistance.....	4
Public Participation	4
Authority and LWCF Allocations	5
Authority	5
Fund Distribution	5
Local Project Selection Process	6
Phase I—Screening.....	6
Phase II—Evaluation	7
Phase III—Recommendations to the State Liaison Officer	7
Local Project Selection Criteria	8
Criteria for the Proposed Project	8
Administrative Criteria	11
Project Relationship with 2010 SCORP Issues	12
Appendix A: Nevada SCORP Strategies	
Appendix B: Nevada LWCF Rating System Worksheet	

INTRODUCTION

The 1965 Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) Act was established with the intent for state and local government entities to share in the funds allocated by Congress each year to the LWCF program. The Nevada State Legislature granted the Administrator of the Nevada Division of State Parks (NDSP) the authority to administer the Land and Water Conservation Fund program for the State of Nevada. Accordingly, NDSP administers the program for Nevada.

A requirement for states to maintain their eligibility to receive LWCF monies is maintenance of an approved Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP), Statewide Wetlands Plan (SWP) and this subsequent “Open Project Selection Process” (OPSP). This OPSP revision incorporates major recreation issues described in the 2010 SCORP and SWP through application/project selection criteria and program administration standards. This OPSP was developed in accordance with the National Park Service (NPS) requirements cited in the OPSP section of the LWCF Grants-in-Aid Manual.

The administration of Nevada’s program, including the selection criteria and rating process is the focus of this document. The rating worksheet was developed to process local acquisition and development projects to ensure that the selection of competing projects for funding is fair and equitable. The criteria used to score and rank local projects are designed to directly address the major outdoor recreation issues identified in the 2010 SCORP. The purpose of the criteria is to: 1) achieve consistent expenditure of these funds to all applicants, and 2) to make sure that the OPSP is based on findings presented in the SCORP.

OVERVIEW

LWCF State Liaison Officer

The LWCF Grants Manual states in Chapter 600.1.3 : “To be eligible for assistance under the LWCF Act, the Governor of each State shall designate in writing an official who has authority to represent and act for the State as the State Liaison Officer in dealing with the Director of the National Park Service for purposes of the LWCF program. The State Liaison Officer (SLO) shall have authority and responsibility to accept and to administer funds paid for approved projects. Upon taking office, a new Governor officially, in writing, re-designates the present State Liaison Officer or appoints a new individual to represent and act for the State in dealing with the LWCF program.”

The current SLO and Assistant SLO are J.Steve Weaver, Deputy Administrator of NDSP and Jennifer Scanland (ASLO) Parks and Recreation Program Manager. Changes in these appointments will be located in the NDSP 620 LWCF official files.

The Nevada Division of State Parks’ LWCF State Liaison Officer (SLO) performs a detailed review of each local project submitted in response to the initial solicitation/notification. The criteria for this review segment of the selection process have been developed by the Division, and are explained in

detail in this document. NDSP projects are processed independently from and do not compete with local projects but must meet the basics requirements of the SCORP and OPSP.

The SLO submits recommendations for program administration, including all grant applications, to the Chief of Planning and Development or Deputy Administrator for review and comment. These reviews are completed and if schedules allow, these recommendations are presented to the **Nevada Advisory Board on Natural Resources (NABNR)**. Although the use of advisory boards is not required, the National Park Service encourages them. The NABNR is a citizen advisory committee that provides citizen oversight of staff recommendations for the entire Department of Conservation and Natural Resources. Due to the current economic situation in our State, this committee is not currently active. When they are active, workload and scheduling conflicts often only allow for updates of the program and individual projects are not reviewed. This ensures that the program goals and this OPSP are adhered to by the SLO. The NABNR has the authority to make recommendations to the Administrator concerning the program's administration. NDSP projects are not submitted to the NABNR for review and recommendations. Instead, state park projects require administrative and legislative authorization.

Recurring Funding Cycles

Nevada's LWCF Grants Program is administered on an annual cycle. The cycle begins each year when the Secretary of the Interior issues the notice of apportionment to the governor. This notification identifies the amount of funds which will be made available to Nevada for the LWCF grant program. However, due to the underfunding of the stateside allocations through recent years, there are times when two funding cycles are combined in order to have enough funds to complete effective projects. **Therefore it will be the funding amounts that will drive the annual or multi-year funding cycles in NV, which will be determined by the SLO.**

Local Projects

Upon notification by the National Park Service of annual stateside LWCF allocations, the Division of State Parks solicits applications for proposed projects from political subdivisions across the state, including Native American tribal governments. Any political subdivisions that respond to the initial announcement are directed to the Division of State Park's website where the application form is available in the two most popular electronic formats for computer downloading. The Grants Handbook is also available on-line at NDSP's website. A hard copy can be requested.

The following funding schedule dates are **approximate** for local programs. They were developed with the assumption that the state will be notified of its annual apportionment by December of each year, following the October beginning of the federal government's fiscal year. If notification is received later, the schedule will be delayed accordingly. Workload and unforeseen issues can also interfere with these **approximate timeframes**.

- December 1 - Public notice is sent to local political subdivisions in Nevada, including all applicable county and city entities, and Native American tribal governments. Press releases are completed as well. The notice will inform them that applications for the current fiscal year will be accepted until the deadline, which occurs approximately 90 days from the date of notification.

- December 1 - Application packages, including the Nevada LWCF Grants Manual, are made available on the internet.
- March 1 - Deadline for submission of current fiscal year applications to the Nevada Division of State Parks.
- April 1 - Applications are reviewed, analyzed, evaluated, and rated per the rating worksheet at Appendix B. The Division's SLO and/or ASLO conduct pre-inspections of the proposed project sites.
- May 1 – Environmental Clearance procedures are conducted for submittal to NSP. Other environmental work may be needed prior to submittal and acceptance by the NPS.
- July 1- Project recommendations are made to the Nevada Advisory Board on Natural Resources (NABNR), when feasible, and to the SLO and Administrator. They are then forwarded to NSP for review and authorization to fund. All applicants are notified of the status of their respective project applications. Each individual application can be forwarded to NPS. A full package of all applications is not required to be submitted at once to the NPS.
- September 1 - Applicants are notified by State Parks on the status of their application with NPS; STATE funding agreements are initiated as NPS approval is attained.

This approximate schedule gives local applicants at least 90 days from the first notice of the availability of funding in which to prepare and submit complete applications.

State Projects

Funds allocated for planning grants and the administration of the grants program is subtracted from the overall allocation prior to construction project funding. The Division of State Parks uses its share of the federal funds on projects which directly benefit visitors to Nevada State Parks. The criteria used to recommend Nevada State Parks' projects for funding also focus on the major recreational issues identified in the 2010 SCORP.

The Chief of Planning and Development, in consultation with the Deputy Administrator, is responsible for the development and submission of the NDSP projects. State park projects require administrative and legislative authorization and therefore are not submitted to the NABNR for review and recommendations.

The Chief of Planning and Development selects state projects for submittal to the NDSP Administrator and SLO or ASLO for approval. The recommendations are forwarded to the National Park Service for final approval. Each individual application can be forwarded alone; a full package of all applications is not required to be submitted at once to the NPS.

Public Notification

The Division maintains a comprehensive mailing list of all potentially eligible applicants. This list includes the names and addresses of political subdivisions throughout the state who have jurisdictional responsibility for recreation, or who may have a related interest in recreational development. Included on this list are the names of special interest groups, professional and community organizations, and others who have expressed an interest in the LWCF program. All of these individuals and groups are contacted and invited to submit applications. Anyone else interested in the LWCF Program in Nevada may find the information posted on the Nevada Division of State Parks website. The announcements include the application schedule, deadline, and anticipated date of notification of approved or selected projects.

Recipients of the initial announcement may request an application packet. Upon receipt of a request, State Parks' staff first informs the potential grantee that all forms and manuals are available on line to download for their convenience. The information includes:

- A description of the LWCF program (including the amount of funds available and due date);
- Application forms;
- A Nevada LWCF Grants Manual (including the criteria for evaluating and rating projects, and an explanation of how the funds will be distributed) for prospective applicants who are unable to download from the Division's website; and
- A summary of any changes to the grants program since the last application period.

Program Technical Assistance

Technical assistance is available to all LWCF applicants through the Nevada Division of State Parks. The NDSP SLO and ASLO will make every effort possible to answer questions regarding application procedures, the proper completion of these grant applications, and the criteria used for project selection and grant awards. Site visits with the applicant should occur prior to the application due date if possible to refine the proposed project.

The Division of State Parks makes available the latest revision of the Nevada LWCF Grants Manual to all local political subdivisions online. This manual is placed on the Division's website or sent, upon request, to all respondents to the initial notice of funding availability. Included in the document are detailed descriptions of the application procedures, requirements, and a sample of the rating worksheet.

THE OPEN PUBLIC SELECTION PROCESS (OPSP)

Public Participation

Federal guidelines require that the state's SCORP and Open Project Selection Process (OPSP) include opportunities for public participation before implementation of the new program criteria. Public participation is required to assure that the preparation and revision of the selection process and rating systems are based on citizen involvement and public participation. In Nevada, public involvement in determining the project selection process was made in several ways.

Public participation throughout the SCORP planning process was instrumental in determining the major outdoor recreational issues which are a significant part of the selection process and rating worksheet for state and local projects. All documents and announcements/press releases were posted on the Division's website. There were multiple public surveys utilized in the process that also ensured public participation and input in development of the SCORP issues and opportunities and therefore, the associated scoring criteria.

Over four years of survey data was used to develop the SCORP and the OPSP; NDSP user survey, 2003, 2005 and 2009. Annual surveys by park staff were also utilized. Also available to us was the National Survey on Recreation and the Environment (NSRE) conducted by the United States Forest Service (USFS) and a detailed NSRE for Nevada. In order to go one step further, we hired an independent contractor to develop a scientific report "The Economic Value of Nevada State Parks"; a research paper completed by the University of NV, Reno, (2009).

Authority

Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 407.207 allows the Division of State Parks, as a representative of state agencies and political subdivisions, to apply for federal funds for any program concerning outdoor recreation, including the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Further, NRS 407.205 permits the administrator of the Division to accept, administer and disburse to other state agencies and political subdivisions grant monies furnished by the Federal Government to the State of Nevada as financial assistance for the planning, acquisition, or development of outdoor recreation projects.

Funding Distribution

Funding Distribution: Any State planning and administration grants are taken off the top of the original allocation prior to breakdown between NDSP and political subdivision project allocations. Departments and other Divisions within the State of Nevada are eligible for funding, but must compete for that funding with the sub-political entities. Traditionally, Nevada's policy has been to split the remaining allocation 50:50 between the state and its various political subdivisions, including Native American tribal governments, after planning costs are subtracted. However, due to the lack of applications and available match from many of the political-subdivisions in the current economy, the 50:50 split will be an objective. If there are not enough applications received from political subdivisions to utilize 50% of the allocation, the State will be eligible for those remaining funds.

Special Reapportionment Account

As projects are completed and closed, or cancelled, the associated funds are designated as being in a Special Re-Appportionment Account (SRA). In order to be authorized to reapportion these funds, the State must have all Federal Reports into the National Park Service and have submitted an SRA request showing that they are up-to-date in meeting the requirements of the federal program. Once these requirements are met, the funds can be reallocated to projects.

The distribution of that SRA will be available to the State year round for additional projects and amendments, but not to political subdivisions, unless the State has no project in queue. At the discretion

of the SLO, funds may be made available to political subdivisions as described below in funding increases and amendment section.

Amendments Including Funding Increases

As projects progress through planning and the bidding process, there are instances where bids come in low and scope can be increased if all related permits, NEPA requirements, etc and construction can be completed within the current grant time frame. The additions to the scope must be coordinated with and approved by the NPS. If SRA or other allocation funds are available, the State may, in coordination with the NPS, increase the funding of a project while ensuring the original Federal percentage does not increase. These funding amendments cannot exceed 30% of the original project cost.

During the formal application period, all sub-political amendments must be rated and compete under the OPSP rating criteria with other applications. Requests for amendments outside the formal application period may be considered if funding is available.

Local Political Subdivision Project Selection Process

The evaluation process is comprised of three phases - Phase I-Screening, Phase II-Evaluation, and Phase III-Recommendations to the State Liaison Officer and on to the National Park Service.

Phase I—Screening

The first phase of the local project selection process is to determine the project's eligibility for further consideration and possible funding selection.

An eligible project application must meet the following requirements:

1. Project Applicant must be an eligible entity.
2. Project applications must be complete and submitted to the Nevada Division of State Parks for receipt by 5:00 p.m. on the date of the deadline. Project applications received after 5:00 p.m. on the date of the deadline will be declined without further actions to process the application. Project sponsors will be notified of the ineligibility.
3. The project must meet the eligibility requirements of the most current National Park Service LWCF Grant Manual and be consistent with the recreational issues as identified in the SCORP.
4. Project applications must identify an established source of eligible matching funds to meet the non-federal share of the project cost by the application deadline.
5. Applicants must show they have adequate control and tenure for project lands (actual project site and lands within 6(f) (3) boundary lands) included in their project proposal. They must prove that they are providing safeguards to adequately meet the perpetual outdoor recreation use requirement contained in the LWCF Act. If they cannot, a deed restriction on said property may be required. Adequate control and tenure is demonstrated by either: a) Fee simple ownership of all the project lands, without any encumbrances which will prevent the land from being fully used as specified in the project proposal; or, b) a lease from the Federal government for 25 years

or more, ALL MUST DEMONSTRATE that they have provided safeguards that adequately meet the perpetual outdoor recreation use requirement contained in the LWCF Act.

Phase II—Evaluation

Projects screened and found to warrant further consideration will be scored and ranked by the ALSO and other staff as assigned by the SLO in accordance with the scoring criteria. The total score awarded to each project will determine rankings. Projects with the highest total scores that fall within the available LWCF funds will be recommended for funding first. If on the event of a grantee/applicant cancelling the project prior to the agreement being signed, the next applicant in line may be considered for funding.

The cutoff on the list of eligible projects recommended for funding will be determined by the amount of federal LWCF funds available. If the last project on the list can only be partially funded, the SLO will ask the local sponsor(s) if they are willing to either increase their percentage to complete the project or reduce the project scope to fit within the available funds. If the project sponsor does not wish to reduce the scope, then the project will be removed from the list of projects recommended for funding for the year. The project ranked next on the list shall be selected and subjected to the same process. The process will be repeated until a project is found for which the available funds can be used. All projects that are not funded in one round may “reapply” for the following year’s funding. No project applications will be “held” for the next round. Again, if there are not sub-political applications to utilize the 50% allocation, State Parks may then use those funds for its’ own projects.

Each application must meet Federal legal requirements including the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) National Historic Preservation Act, Endangered Species Act, etc., (refer to LWCF Federal Manual). This information is presented to the State by the local applicant in the application. . The State SLO will work diligently with the applicant to meet the requirements of NEPA and the NPS. However, failure to do so by the applicant can result in an ineligible application or cancellation of the agreement.

Phase III - Recommendations to the State Liaison Officer

Having completed Phases I and II above, the ASLO provides a summary of project descriptions, scoring, and other applicable materials to the SLO for approval. They are then presented to the National Park Service’s appropriate office contact. Currently, our contact is in the Seattle office. The federal forms such as 424 and others are prepared and signed by the State and sent to the NPS for each grant. A Federal agreement is signed between the State and the NPS. A State agreement is then signed between the grantee and the State of Nevada with the federal documents attached and referenced. This officially holds the grantee fully responsible in meeting the Federal laws associated with the funding.

PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA
Land and Water Conservation Fund
State of Nevada
(Maximum Score of 220 Points)

The scoring criteria utilized with the rating worksheet covers criteria in three general subject areas; the proposed project, administrative, and specific SCORP strategies. These criteria are described in detail below. The criteria are presented in the same order that they appear on the rating worksheet. Comments about higher or lower scores relate only to that criterion, not the overall score a project may receive. Each of these criteria is directly related to one of the SCORP Strategies or Administration of the Program.

A. CRITERIA FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT (Maximum Score of 90 Points)

1. *Project Use & Design (0 to 10 points)*

This is in response to SCORP Strategy 2, 7, and 8. Degree to which the project will provide features attractive to populations with special recreation requirements (i.e. senior citizens, youth, disabled persons, minorities, etc.).

Maximum Score of 10 Points

- | | |
|-----------|---------|
| a. High | 8 to 10 |
| b. Medium | 4 to 7 |
| c. Low | 0 to 3 |

2. *Ability to Satisfy Basic Outdoor Recreation Needs (1 to 10 points)*

This is in response to SCORP Strategy 1, 2, and 5. Project will provide needed facilities where none now exist or where existing facilities are obsolete and in need of redesign/redevelopment.

Maximum Score of 10 Points

- a. Project will provide needed facilities where **No** outdoor recreation facilities currently exist (7 to 10 points). The goal is to get needed facilities in communities that have no outdoor recreation opportunities. Providing opportunities in areas completely void of opportunities is the highest priority.
- b. Project will augment existing facilities where they are insufficient to meet existing needs (4 to 6 points). This can be through new facilities or preferably through redesign or redevelopment of obsolete facilities. SCORP Strategy #1 urges applicants to "Take care of what we already have". It is undesirable to have closed or publicly unsafe facilities. Communities or areas may have outdoor recreation facilities but the quantity is not sufficient to meet the demand. For example, a community may have one softball field but actually needs two fields to accommodate the softball teams assigned to leagues in the area.
- c. Project will provide needed facilities where the particular type of facility proposed does not exist or/and where existing facilities are obsolete and in need of redesign/redevelopment (1 to 3 points). Once a community or area has outdoor recreation opportunities, the next priority is

to improve the mix of those opportunities or to update/redesign obsolete facilities. For example, a community may have a picnic area but no softball fields.

3. *Public Participation in Project Planning (0 to 10 points)*

Degree to which the project proposal has involved members of the public in the planning process. This is in response to SCORP Strategy 7 and Administrative Processes. Projects that demonstrate public involvement during the planning phase (through workshops, input during planning commission meetings, opportunities for written comments, letters of endorsement from political subdivisions or civic organizations, etc.) will be ranked higher than projects in which the public was not involved or supportive of the planning process.

Maximum Score of 10 Points

- | | |
|-----------|---------|
| a. High | 8 to 10 |
| b. Medium | 4 to 7 |
| c. Low | 0 to 3 |

4. *Demand for Facility (0 to 10 Points)*

Based on evidence supplied with pre-award discussion, project proposal, public preference or participation surveys, supply/demand analyses, current use figures at similar facilities, other locally generated statistics, planning documentation, or other documented justification (choose one). Projects with evidence of demand for specified facilities, such as a public preference survey, recreation participation survey, supply/demand analysis, existing site use statistics, current use figures at similar nearby facilities, public workshops, master plans developed through a public input forum or other documented evidence will be given preference over projects with weak or lack of such evidence.

Maximum Score of 10 Points

- | | |
|-----------|---------|
| a. High | 8 to 10 |
| b. Medium | 4 to 7 |
| c. Low | 0 to 3 |

5. *Land Ownership (0 to 10 points)*

Development projects which have fee simple title, permanent easements, or a long-term lease of the project property from the Federal Government, will be ranked above those which have shorter term leases. Lease terms under 25 years with the Federal Government are ineligible. Leases between sub-political agencies or governments must have either both or the title holder as the signature and sponsor on the agreement.

Maximum Score of 10 Points

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|----|
| a. Fee simple or permanent easement | 10 |
| b. Lease or more than 25 years | 5 |
| c. Lease of 25 years | 0 |

6. *Creativity and Originality (0 to 5 Points)*

Degree to which project demonstrates creative solutions and/or originality in design (i.e., alternative energy provisions, low maintenance features, multiple-use provisions, etc.), and

shows potential for applications to other projects. Of particular interest are projects that propose innovations or creative solutions with potential applications to other projects in the future. Projects with such creativity will receive a higher rating than those that demonstrate little or no creativity or originality. Also included should be facilities that creatively attract families and youth into the outdoors.

7. *Anticipated Use of Facility (1 to 5 Points)*

This is in response to SCORP Strategy 2, 5, 7 and 8 and is based on number of visitors anticipated on an annual basis. Projects which serve larger numbers of users or populations will score higher.

Maximum Score of 5 Points

a. High	100,000 or more	5
b. Medium-High	75,000 to 99,999	4
c. Medium	50,000 to 74, 999	3
d. Medium-Low	10,000 to 49,999	2
e. Low	Less than 10,000	1

8. *Inter-Jurisdictional Partnerships (0 to 15 Points)*

(Check all that apply. Score 3 points per entity, up to a maximum of 15 Points.)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Federal | <input type="checkbox"/> Improvement District |
| <input type="checkbox"/> State | <input type="checkbox"/> Unincorporated Community |
| <input type="checkbox"/> County | <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Profit Organization |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Town or City | <input type="checkbox"/> Organized User Group |
| <input type="checkbox"/> School District | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify _____) |

This is in response to SCORP Strategy 3. The relative degree of inter-agency and/or public-private cooperation, support and particularly funding leverage, will be weighed; multiple partnerships will take precedence over single entity sponsors with no partnerships. Partnerships may consist of management/operational agreements, funding relationships, volunteered labor, sponsorships, donated equipment or materials, etc. Projects which can demonstrate strong local or regional coordination and cooperation from various public or private agencies and organizations in terms of volunteerism, donations, etc., will be ranked higher than those which exhibit little or no public coordination and cooperation. Of interest to this criterion is support that contributes directly to the completion of the project as proposed in the application. Letters of support, although of some importance, without the author making any other commitment to the project will not be awarded any points.

9. *Economically Depressed Community Status (0 to 15 Points)* Written justification with data sources must be provided in the application.

This is in response to SCORP Strategy 1, 2, 3 and 8. Compare the average household income or the average unemployment rate of the project service area with the countywide or statewide economic data, whichever is appropriate. This particular criterion awards economically depressed communities with points for grant awards over communities with stronger economies. Partial credit: An applicant may receive partial credit for the economically depressed

community status scoring criterion if a portion of the service area is economically depressed. For example, if the service area is comprised of an entire county, and a portion of the county's average household income is less than the statewide average household income, points will be awarded based on that percentage.

Maximum Score of 15 Points

- a. High 11 to 15
- b. Medium 6 to 10
- c. Low 0 to 5

B. ADMINISTRATIVE CRITERIA (Maximum Score of 50 Points)

1. LWCF Protection Legacy (1 to 10 Points)

Park sites that have never received a LWCF grant will be given preference over previous recipients. This is in reference to national goals to increase the LWCF protection legacy.

Maximum Score of 10 Points

- a. This project site has never received a LWCF grant. 10
- b. This project site has received a LWCF grant within the last 15 years. 5
- c. This project site has received a LWCF grant within the last 5 years. 0

2. Operations and Maintenance (0 to 10 Points)

Record of sponsor's performance during the last 10 years in operating and maintaining existing facilities is an indicator of ability and commitment to adequately operate and maintain (O&M) future LWCF program funded facilities. Or if the sponsor is new, is there an O&M plan? This should be determined during the 5 year self and spot inspections, as well as, pre-inspection of the current site.

Maximum Score of 10 Points

- a. High 8 to 10
- b. Medium 4 to 7
- c. Low 0 to 3

3. Post Completion Inspections and 5 year Self-inspection Compliance (0 to 10 Points)

Prospective sponsors of new projects that are currently in compliance with the 5-year self-inspection program for previously funded LWCF projects will be given preference. Sponsors willing to meet their obligations within 30 days of the application deadline will be given partial credit on the scoring. Sponsors who fail to comply within the 30-day grace period will be declared ineligible for a grant award during the current grant cycle. No further action will be taken on the sponsor's current or future applications until the post completion inspections are completed.

Maximum Score of 10 points

- a. 5-year self-inspections of previously funded LWCF projects (10)
- b. Sponsor was not in compliance prior to submitting application, but sponsor did meet compliance obligations for self-inspections program obligations within 30 days of submitting application (5).

- c. Sponsor failed to comply with self-inspections program obligations within 30 days after submitting applications. **INELIGIBLE 0 points**

4. *Project Readiness (0 to 10 Points)*

Because it is the intent of the LWCF program to use available LWCF grant funds in a timely manner to develop new or to improve existing public outdoor recreation opportunities, time required for a sponsor to begin the implementation of proposed projects shall be a factor in the selection process. Projects that have environmental work to NEPA standards complete prior to application will therefore receive higher points. ***Project Construction will begin in:***

Maximum Score of 10 Points

- | | |
|---------------------|----|
| a. Within one year | 10 |
| b. Within two years | 5 |
| c. Over two years | 0 |

5. *Organization & Completeness of Application (0 to 10 Points)*

Applications organized and completed in accordance with the instructions will receive a higher score for this criterion than applications less organized or complete. Applications so grossly incomplete that processing is not possible will be declared ineligible and returned to the sponsor without further action.

Maximum Score of 10 Points

- | | |
|-----------|---------|
| a. High | 8 to 10 |
| b. Medium | 4 to 7 |
| c. Low | 0 to 3 |

C. PROJECT RELATIONSHIP WITH CURRENT SCORP ISSUES
(Maximum Score of 80 Points)

The “Nevada’s 2010 Outdoor Recreation Plan” identified eight (8) strategies for improving outdoor recreation in Nevada. Determine which of the 8 strategies are being addressed by the project. The applicant must have provided written description of how the project helps to move these strategies forward in order to be scored. It is important that the proposed project address at least one or more of the 8 major outdoor recreation issues identified in the 2010 SCORP. Please refer to the 2010 SCORP for details of each strategy or Appendix A of this document.

The following strategies have been developed to guide the selection criteria process. The applicant is required to give written description of **how their project helps in promoting or providing for the advancement of these 8 SCORP strategies.** Well defined, succinct answers can further impact the criteria scoring in Section A, as well as this section.

Each SCORP Strategy is worth 10 points ranging between does not address strategy, to fully addresses strategy. (Please refer to Appendix A for detail.)

- 1. Ensure proper maintenance and upkeep of existing outdoor recreation facilities. Manage impacts to outdoor recreation sites from increasing usage.*
- 2. Provide an appropriate level of facilities and services at outdoor recreation sites.*
- 3. Ensure sufficient ongoing funding for existing and planned outdoor recreation facilities.*
- 4. Promote conservation of statewide water resources and wild land areas. Strive to work with partners to gain landscape level conservation: river, riparian and natural water bodies and land conservation for wildlife and their habitats.*
- 5. Maintain and improve access to public land.*
- 6. Maximize connectivity of existing and planned public trail systems.*
- 7. Increase public information resources about outdoor recreation and educational facilities and opportunities at outdoor recreation sites.*
- 8. Increase public outreach on outdoor recreation to children, students and currently underserved populations.*

-End-